



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,648	08/07/2006	Ryo Sakurai	Q96393	9259
23373 7590 12/27/2011				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/27/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@sughrue.com

sughrue@sughrue.com

PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/588,648

Applicant(s)

SAKURAI ET AL.

Examiner

SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/c3)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

The following office action is in response to the response filed on October 27, 2011. Claims 1-6 are pending. Claim 1 is amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecain et al (WO 03/104884) in view of Ogura et al (US 5,739,888).

As to independent claim 1, Lecain et al teach an information display device, in which display media are sealed between a front substrate and a rear substrate, at least one of the front substrate and the rear substrate being transparent (page 16, line 22-page 17, line 31), and at least one of the front substrate and the rear substrate being flexible, and in which the display media (page 16, line 22-page 17, line 31), to which an electrostatic field is applied, are made to move so as to display information such as an image (page 16, lines 22-page 17, line 31; page 20, line 3-30; page 24, line 38-page 25, line 22), , and the sealing agent arranging portion is disposed between outermost walls of partition walls for forming cells and a rib disposed on at least on of the front substrate and the rear substrate (page 39, lines 6-29; page 41, line 25-page 42, line 12).

Lecain et al teach spacers (572 and 574), however, do not teach a plurality of spacers are arranged on a surface of at least one of the front and the rear substrate in a sealing agent arranging portion, which seals a space between the front substrate and the rear substrate by a

sealing agent and where the sealing agent portion is located on the outer periphery of the display. Ogura et al teach a plurality of spacers (11), front and rear substrates (1 and 2), sealing agent (10), and where the sealing agent portion is along an outer periphery of the display device (Fig.1, along the edge) (col. 6, lines 33-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the spacers as taught by Ogura et al into Lecain et al in order to maintain a gap between the substrate and rigidity of the seal portion (Ogura et al, abstract, col. 3, line 30-col. 4, line 25)

As to dependent claim 3, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Lecain et al teach wherein a total area of the spacers on at least the front substrate and the rear substrate is 0.5-50% of the sealing agent arranging portion on at least one of the front substrate and the rear substrate (page 40, lines 17-29).

As to dependent claim 4, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Ogura et al teach where the spacers have a dotted shape (Fig. 1).

As to dependent claim 5, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Lecain et al teach wherein the display media comprise at least one of particles and liquid powders (page 16, line 22-page 17, line 31).

As to dependent claim 6, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Ogura et al teach wherein the plurality of spacers contact both the front substrate and the rear substrate (Fig. 2).

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecain et al (WO 03/104884) in view of Ogura et al (US 5,739,888) and further in view of Niiya et al (US 6,674,503).

As to dependent claim 2, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Lecain et al and Ogura et al do not teach wherein the spacers are manufactured simultaneously when partition walls for forming cells between the front substrate and the rear substrate are arranged on at least the front substrate and the rear substrate. Niiya et al teach wherein the spacers are manufactured simultaneously when partition walls for forming cells between the front substrate and the rear substrate are arranged on at least the front substrate and the rear substrate (col. 7, lines 17-27). It would have been obvious to include simultaneous manufacturing of the spacers as taught by Niiya et al into Lecain as modified by Ogura in order to provide efficiency and reduce cost.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As applicant has amended claim 1, the new grounds of rejection in view of Ogura is shown above, and made FINAL.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-7769. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SRILAKSHMI K KUMAR/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2629

SKK
12/18/2011